Ham-Policy Digest            Tue,  9 Feb 93      Volume 93 : Issue   34

Today's Topics:
                         Abandonment of CW
                       No Code Proposition
        What prevents someone from having 2 amateur licenses?
                   You may still be asked to send code!

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party.  Your mileage may vary.  So there.
----------------------------------------------------------------------

Date: 8 Feb 93 22:10:35 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
sol.ctr.columbia.edu!caen!rphroy!link.ph.gmr.com!vbreault@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Abandonment of CW
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1kuc87INN8u6@topaz.bds.com> ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:

   > Congratulations!  You are one of the few Extra class higher-ups
   > who realizes the futility of CW wpm requirements.  As for me,
   > I still have trouble with 5wpm!

   Nonsense!  Many of the most stident no-code proponents are Extra
   class hams.  I did 20 WPM because it was there.  While I operate CW,
   I'm nowhere near that fast in real life (I can do 13 solid).
   Frankly the *ONLY* reason the requirement is there is to make it
   HARD to get to the Extra class.  Frankly, I'd support another way
   to demonstrate "EXTRA" than CW.

-Ron (WO2L)

I too am an Extra Class amateur radio operator and I use Morse code
almost exclusively when operating on the HF bands.   While I would
scarcely call my stand strident, I would fully support a motion to
replace the high speed Morse code requirement with a filter that is
at least as difficult, but much more contemporary.

Unless and until that day arrives, I offer this, my testimony.
----------------------------------------------------------------
The 20wpm challenge was, in my case, just that; a challenge.
I made it my personal goal to do that thing that so many other
operators had done before.  "After all" I reasoned "they have no
more innate talent than I do.  If someone of (name of Extra Class
operator) talents can do it then I *CERTAINLY* ought to be able
to do it."  (Sounds immodest but it's not.... trust me.... I know
a number of Extra Class operators that, while genuinely great and
wonderful people, are really NO MORE talented than you or I.)

I looked at it as any other challenge.... bettering my golf score,
picking up the tough splits when bowling, raising my GPA... the
list goes on.  It was just one more.

I worked at it day by day.  Sometimes I'd have to miss a day or
two or even a week or more.  The demands of a career, a cubscout
den a family (7 kids!) and the holiday season all conflicted  with
time available for studying Morse code.  Some times the speed would
increase, some times it would fall.  Fortunately, there were more
ups than downs.  :-)

I made a game of it.  It was fun.  I really got a charge out of
speeding up the code generator.  I really felt pumped when I could
get those short bursts of really solid copy at 18wpm.

I still do :-) :-)

I don't remember how long I worked on it....  Something like four
or five months.  I didn't think I was ready when the exam date rolled
around but I had set the night aside for it and wouldn't be able to
make it to the next couple of testing sessions..... so I gave it a try.

The night I passed that exam I was actually surprised!
----------------------------------------------------------------

Okay, so what to do?  Here's what I suggest:

FACT:
The high speed code requirement isn't going to go away any time soon.

OPINION:
In light of that fact, I believe that anyone that is waiting for
the requirements to change before proceeding with an upgrade is
either wasting time, rattling sabers or isn't really all that
interested in upgrading.

If you are currently working on an upgrade and are having trouble
with the code speed.... take heart....   People with a lot less on
the ball than you have done it before.  They managed to do it by
using the same technique that you are: They practiced and practiced.

If you (the collective "you", no one in particular) really want to
upgrade then I suggest that you "just do it".  It isn't all that hard
and it doesn't take all that much talent.  I, for example, can't play
an instrument, have a lousy short term memory and can't even write
legibly above 13 wpm.  I've done it.... You *CAN* do it.

(Please don't read that to say "I had to do it so you have to do it".
 I *REALLY* don't feel that way.  Read it so say "You CAN do it and
 until the rules change, you'll have to do it in order to upgrade.")

***THEN***

When you've gotten your Extra Class license and have nothing to
gain by removal of the high speed CW requirement, then you can join
us in our campaign to remove it.  Somehow it sounds classier coming
from an Extra than from a Technician.  :-)  :-)
--
-val-

Val Breault - GM Research - vbreault@gmr.com - N8OEF          \      /|
Instrumentation dept., 30500 Mound Rd., Warren, MI 48090-9055   \    / |
The opinions expressed by the author do not necessarily reflect  \  /__|
those of GMR or those of the General Motors Corporation.          \/  |___


------------------------------

Date: 8 Feb 93 16:34:38 GMT
From: news.cerf.net!netsys!pagesat!olivea!apple!catnip!kc6sss@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No Code Proposition
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

ObLesson: Read your history first.

swalton@mail.boi.hp.com (Sean_Walton; 85U524; x3821) writes:

[...]

>So, I have a proposal: change the rules to either of the following--

>    1) Require that the No Code License be renewed every few
>    years (much less than the current 10 years) by re-testing

>    2) Make the license itself a "temporary" license which must
>    be upgraded with code within a period of time.

Prior to late September 1967, Novice licences were good for only
one year and were non-renewable.

Prior to 12/75, all licenses not only had to be upgraded every 5 years,
but you also had to certify [subject to random verification] that you
could pass the code requirement for the license class you held.

Extracted from QST, Feb '76, page 58:

Operating Time for Renewal

The Federal Communications Commission has dropped the operating time
and code speed requirements for renewal of an Amateur Radio Service
license.  Up to December 24, an applicant had to state that he had
operated two hours in the last three months or five hours in the last
year of the license term, and that he could still copy code at 5, 13 or
20 wpm depending on his class of license.  ********"No one has ever
demonstrated that any identifiable relationship exists between the
requirements of Section 97.13(a) and an individual's competence as a
radio ameteur," the Commission declared.********

[emphasis mine]

Please note that the last sentence is almost exactly the same sentence
contained in the document that dropped the code requirement from
the Technician license.

Similarly, the FCC rejected a RM which requested that they drop the
code requirement from the Technician license by quoting from the
IRU regulations requiring the knowledge of Morse Code as a prerequisite
for holding an amateur radio license.

------------------------------

Date: 8 Feb 93 14:36:32 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: What prevents someone from having 2 amateur licenses?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Part 97.5(d)(1) "A primary station license is issued only to a person,
together with an operator license on the same document.  Every amateur
operator licensed by the FCC must have one, but only one, primary
station license."
--
David L. Wilson                 INTERNET:  dwilson@s850.mwc.edu
Dept. of Mathematics-Trinkle    Phone: (703) 898-1084 (H)
Mary Washington College                (703) 899-4744 (W/voice mail)
Fredericksburg, VA  22401        Amateur callsign:  AC4IU


------------------------------

Date: 8 Feb 93 22:23:06 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!
mckee@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: You may still be asked to send code!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Steve Popovich (popovich@cs.columbia.edu) wrote:

: Now, that is a thoroughly strange thing to say.  First off, since the
: same book gives procedures for completely exempting handicapped
: candidates from the 13 and 20 WPM code exams, what's the point of even
: having a procedure for an accommodated code test for any speed but 5
: WPM?  I can't imagine what sort of handicap would be severe enough to
: need accommodation on a 13 or 20 WPM code exam but would also not be
: severe enough to merit exemption from the 13 and 20 WPM code exams.
: Perhaps I'm missing something here.


What I think you are missing is pride of accomplishment.  I recently sent
code at 13 WPM to a handicaped ham who had a signed waiver IN HAND.  He
thought he could pass the test with accommidation and preferred that to
the waiver.  He had very limited motion and I had to pause between characters,
but he could copy, and I've never felt better for an applicant
who passed.  He promises to be back for 20...


73,
Bret

------------------------------

Date: 8 Feb 93 20:10:27 GMT
From: adobe!swirsky@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <9302050341.AA03133@netmail.microsoft.com>,
<1993Feb5.200507.4227@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>,
<1993Feb6.201812.27631@cbfsb.cb.att.com>
Subject : Re: You may still be asked to send code!

In article <1993Feb6.201812.27631@cbfsb.cb.att.com> wa2ise@cbnewsb.cb.att.com
(robert.f.casey) writes:
>>but I don't think it means anything.
>
>Couldn't resist:  I'm 6 months from being an OF (I'm 39.5), and "I had
>to send code at the FCC test office somewheres in NYC."  Remember the
>place was painted a yucky shade of dirty green.

That "somewheres in NYC" was 201 Varick (down the street from the
famous Ramrod bar).

Even worse than the dirty green walls were the inductively coupled
wireless headphones used for the receiving tests. If you moved your
head wrong, you'd pick up more 60 cycle hum than code!

I think the sending test was dropped in '76 or '77.

I became quite familiar with 201 Varick when I went for my
amateur licenses (never failed one!) and the Commercial telephone
and telegraph. (It took me more than 1 try to get the now-defunct
first phone.)

It would be nice if you still had the option of taking the test
at the FCC. If, for example, you disagreed with the politics of the
ARRL or other organization, you wouldn't have to depend of their
volunteers to get your license.

--
"Duff Beer for Me,
 Duff Beer for You,
 I'll have a Duff Beer,
 You'll have one, too!" -- Duff Gardens Theme Song

------------------------------

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #34
******************************